	il de la companya de
1	KEVIN RYAN (CSBN 118321) United States Attorney
2	EUMI L. CHOI (WVSBN 0722) Chief, Criminal Division
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	DEREK R. OWENS (CASBN 230237) Special Assistant United States Attorney  ACADIA L. SENESE Law Clerk  450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-6488 Fax: (415) 436-7234 Email: Derek.Owens@usdoj.gov  Attorneys for Plaintiff
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
15	
16 17	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) CR No.: 05-00726 MAG
18	) Plaintiff, ) <u>STIPULATION AND</u> PROPOSED ORDER EXCLUDING
19	TIME  v.
20	KHAHILIAH THYJUAN JACKSON,
21	
22	Defendant.
23	On December 13, 2005, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that
24	time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from December 13, 2005 to
25	January 27, 2006 for effective preparation of counsel, in that defense counsel required adequate
26	time for effective assistance of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the
<ul><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>	continuance was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel,
۷.	taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The
	Stipulation and Proposed Order Excluding Time

## 

1	parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the
2	best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).
3	SO STIPULATED:
4	KEVIN V. RYAN United States Attorney
5	Office States Attorney
6	DATED:12-13-05
7	Law Clerk
8	DATED: 12/13/05 /s/
9	ELIZABETH M. FALK Attorney for Ms. Jackson
10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11	As the Court found on December 13, 2005, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds
12	that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and
13	the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act
14	calculations from December 13, 2005 to January 27, 2006 for effective preparation of defense
15	counsel and the United States. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the
16	requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation
17	and continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
18	miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).
19	STES DISTRICT
20	SO ORDERED.
21	DATED: December 19, 2005  FLIZARED  GRANTED
22	ELIZAREII United State Lynch D. Laporte
23	
24	THEN DISTRICT OF CE
25	
26	
27	
28	

Stipulation and Froposed Order Excluding Time